

**REMARKS**

In the last Office Action, the Examiner rejected claims 1-4, 6-12, 14-20, and 22-26 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No 6,854,062 to Okamoto ("Okamoto") in view of U.S. Patent No. 7,010,600 to Prasad et al. ("Prasad") and U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2004/0203600 to McCorkle et al. ("McCorkle"); rejected claims 5, 13, and 21 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Okamoto in view of Prasad, McCorkle, and U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2003/0046352 to Katsuda et al. ("Katsuda"); and rejected claim 27 as being unpatentable over Okamoto in view of Prasad, McCorkle, and JP 2002-281019 to Jinriki et al ("Jinriki").

By this amendment, Applicants amend claims 1, 9, and 26. Claims 1-27 remain pending.

Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection of the claims under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a). The cited art, alone or in combination, fails to present a *prima facie* case of obviousness.

Independent claim 1 recites, among other things, "a local environment management unit configured to authenticating, base on the information from the removable mediating device, that the first device and the second device are connected within the certain range when it is determined that a time between the physical connection of the mediating device to the first mediating interface and the physical connection of the mediating device to the second mediating interface is within a predetermined period of time." The cited art, even if combined, fails to disclose or suggest the claimed local environment management unit.

Instead, *Okamoto* merely discloses a system for incorporating data into a household device using a bridging medium. Abstract. Indeed, the Office Action merely relies on *Okamoto* to teach "local and the environment management means, based on the information of the mediating device, configured to authenticate." Office Action at p. 6. *Okamoto*, at best, discloses validating a signature in a bridging device to determine whether data is valid when devices are not connected by a network. Col. 1, line 62 - Col. 2, line 6. Accordingly, *Okamoto* fails to disclose or suggest "a local environment management unit configured to authenticating, base on the information from the removable mediating device, that the first device and the second device are connected within the certain range when it is determined that a time between the physical connection of the mediating device to the first mediating interface and the physical connection of the mediating device to the second mediating interface is within a predetermined period of time."

*Prasad* fails to overcome the deficiencies set forth above, including the failure of *Okamoto* to disclose or suggest at least the above-quoted elements of amended independent claim 1.

Instead, *Prasad* discloses a method for managing network resources in multiple administrative domains. Abstract. In *Prasad*, when a user requests a resource of a second administrative domain, a component examines a token and a role to determine whether to grant access to the resource. *Id.* The token of *Prasad* may include an expiration time stamp to indicate when a token expires. Col. 8, lines 50-57. The expiration time of may indicate that a role expires after a set time. Col. 9, lines 4-14. At best, *Prasad* discloses a time at which access will be denied because a role has

expired. Accordingly, *Prasad* also fails to disclose or suggest "a local environment management unit configured to authenticating, base on the information from the removable mediating device, that the first device and the second device are connected within the certain range when it is determined that a time between the physical connection of the mediating device to the first mediating interface and the physical connection of the mediating device to the second mediating interface is within a predetermined period of time."

*McCorkle* fails to overcome the deficiencies set forth above, including the failure of *Okamoto* and *Prasad* to disclose or suggest at least the above-quoted elements of amended independent claim 1.

Instead, *McCorkle* discloses a method for providing authentication in a wireless network, wherein an authentication device evaluates a first and a second distance measurement to determine if they meet authentication criteria. Abstract. However, even if the Office Action's assertion that "McCorkle teaches the first device and the second device are connected within a certain range" (p. 7.) is correct, which Applicant does not concede, *McCorkle* does not cure the deficiencies of *Okamoto* and *Prasad* in disclosing or suggesting "a local environment management unit configured to authenticating, base on the information from the removable mediating device, that the first device and the second device are connected within the certain range when it is determined that a time between the physical connection of the mediating device to the first mediating interface and the physical connection of the mediating device to the second mediating interface is within a predetermined period of time."

*Katsuda* fails to overcome the deficiencies set forth above, including the failure of *Okamoto*, *Prasad*, and *McCorkle* to disclose or suggest at least the above-quoted elements of amended independent claim 1. Instead, *Katsuda* teaches a scanner that is capable of functioning as a data transmission management device. Abstract.

*Jinriki* fails to overcome the deficiencies set forth above, including the failure of *Okamoto*, *Prasad*, *McCorkle*, and *Katsuda* to disclose or suggest at least the above-quoted elements of amended independent claim 1. Instead, *Jinriki* discloses an authentication method for attesting that an IC card is the right thing. Abstract.

Accordingly, the cited art, alone or in combination, fails to disclose or suggest "a local environment management unit configured to authenticating, base on the information from the removable mediating device, that the first device and the second device are connected within the certain range when it is determined that a time between the physical connection of the mediating device to the first mediating interface and the physical connection of the mediating device to the second mediating interface is within a predetermined period of time," as recited in claim 1.

In view of the foregoing, there are significant differences between the cited art and claimed invention that the Office Action fails to address, including the mischaracterization of *Prasad*. Therefore, the cited art fails render claim 1 obvious.

Independent claims 9, 17, and 26, and dependent claims 2-8, 10-16, 18-25 and 27, while of different scope than claim 1, are allowable over the cited art for at least similar reasons as claim 1.

Applicant respectfully requests that this Amendment under 37 C.F.R. § 1.116 be entered by the Examiner, placing the claims in condition for allowance. Applicant

submits that the proposed amendments of the claims do not raise new issues or necessitate the undertaking of any additional search of the art by the Examiner, since all of the elements and their relationships claimed were either earlier claimed or inherent in the claims as examined. Therefore, this Amendment should allow for immediate action by the Examiner.

Furthermore, Applicant respectfully points out that the final action by the Examiner presented some new arguments as to the application of the art against Applicant's invention. It is respectfully submitted that the entering of the Amendment would allow the Applicant to reply to the final rejections and place the application in condition for allowance.

Finally, Applicant submits that the entry of the Amendment would place the application in better form for appeal, should the Examiner dispute the patentability of the pending claims.

In view of the foregoing remarks, Applicant submits that this claimed invention, as amended, is neither anticipated nor rendered obvious in view of the prior art references cited against this application. Applicant therefore requests the entry of this Amendment, the Examiner's reconsideration and reexamination of the application, and the timely allowance of the pending claims.

Please grant any extensions of time required to enter this response and charge  
any additional required fees to Deposit Account 06-0916.

Respectfully submitted,

FINNEGAN, HENDERSON, FARABOW,  
GARRETT & DUNNER, L.L.P.

Dated: September 17, 2010

By:   
David W. Hill  
Reg. No. 28,220  
(202) 408-4000

Philip J. Hoffmann  
Registration No. 46,340